



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,700	07/05/2001	Mark Moir	01512	3507

24118 7590 04/20/2005
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN
228 W 17TH PLACE
TULSA, OK 74119

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/899,700

Applicant(s)

MOIR, MARK

Examiner

Sumaiya A. Chowdhury

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/6/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chor et al. (6,141,003).

Considering claim 1, Chor discloses an internet capability user selectable function of a broadcast receiver (50-figure 3, col. 3, lines 34-50, col. 4, lines 27-34), the capability comprising:

allowing the opening and retention of at least two window displays of internet data (the system has the capability to open more than one internet web pages - see col. 2, line 62 – col. 3, line 2 and col. 5, lines 25-28) and allowing selective display of one of the windows on the display screen (e.g. when one window is displayed, the other window is minimized - col. 10, lines 7-25), each window display displaying a page from a user selected web site (col. 10, lines 7-25), when a window display is generated in response to user selection, information data relating to that window is entered into an information display (the

bottom task bar indicating the active web sites, windows and/or programs in figure 7 and col. 10, lines 7-25) and information is added to the information display (task bar) for each window display which is generated and available for viewing (col. 10, lines 7-25).

As for claim 2, Chor discloses that only one window is displayed at a time when the other window is minimized (col. 10, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 3, Chor discloses that the display is a television screen (col. 3, lines 49-56).

As for claim 4, Chor discloses that the information display is continuously displayed while the internet is in use via the broadcast data receiver (col. 3, lines 57-67 and col. 10, lines 7-24).

As for claim 5, Chor discloses that the information display displays information for each window display which has been opened following a user selection and is available for viewing at that instant (col. 10, lines 7-25).

As for claim 7, Chor discloses an internet capability wherein the information display includes the display of a title for each window display available for selection (col. 10, lines 7-25).

As for claim 8, Chor discloses an internet capability wherein the information display is interactive and includes one or a range of options to allow user control of the window which is displayed (col. 2, lines 53-67).

As for claim 9, Chor discloses an internet capability wherein the interaction includes the option for the user to activate or select to view a window indicated on the information display which then causes the selected window to be displayed across the display screen (col. 10, lines 7-24).

As for claim 11, Chor discloses an internet capability wherein the window display selected for display is displayed across the entire display screen with the exception of the said information display (col. 10, lines 7-24).

As for claim 12, Chor discloses an internet capability wherein the information display stretches across the length of the display screen and is split into sections, each section indicating a particular window display available for viewing (166 and 168 – figure 7, col. 10, lines 7-24).

As for claim 14, Chor discloses a broadcast data receiver for the reception of data broadcast from a remote location (col. 4, lines 27- 43) and the processing of the same to allow the generation of user selectable television programs displayed via a

Art Unit: 2611

television set connected to or provided with the broadcast data receiver (col.3, lines 49-67) comprising:

interaction with a user via a remote control (col.3, lines 35-47), and including as a user selectable additional function, an internet capability (col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 1-5), said capability controlled by the user via the remote control device (col. 3, lines 35-47) and each window display generated from the internet capability is required to be displayed across the display screen of the television set with one display shown at a time and an information display is also shown on the display screen during the use of the internet capability (166 and 168 – figure 7, col. 10, lines 7-24), said information display generated to indicate information identifying each of the window displays which are live and available for viewing at that time, regardless of whether or not the window display is being displayed on the display screen at that time (166 and 168 – figure 7, col. 10, lines 7-24).

As for claim 16, Chor discloses a broadcast data receiver wherein when a user selects a window display from the internet, information data identifying that window display is added to a memory in the broadcast data receiver and, the information data held in the memory is used by the broadcast data receiver to generate the information display at that instant (the receiver comprises memory devices: ROM, RAM, col. 4, lines 16-26, in executing operation with a CPU for processing and all system housekeeping-inclusive of all taskbar information).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chor (6,141,003) in view of Oran (5,757,371).

As for claim 10, Chor fails to disclose the information display included user selectable option to close the window.

In an analogous art, Oran discloses a computer receiver having an information display (28 –figure 11) which includes a user selectable option to close the window (66 – figure 11, col. 8, lines 11-21). This enables a user to conveniently close an active or open program/window.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Chor's system to include the information display includes user selectable option to close the window, as taught by Oran, for the advantage of providing a convenient technique of exiting an open program.

Considering claim 13, Chor fails to disclose wherein the length of each section decreases as the number of available window display increases.

In an analogous art, Oran discloses a computer receiver comprising an information display (28 – figure 5) having sections wherein the length of each section decreases (col. 7, lines 5-19). This provides the benefit of providing information of each open or active program/window

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Chor's system to include the length of each section to decrease as the number of available window display increases, as taught by Oran, for the benefit of providing information of each active program.

Considering claim 15, Chor fails to disclose an information display which includes an indicator to indicate which window is displayed on the screen at that instant.

In an analogous art, Oran discloses a computer receiver comprising an information display (28 – figure 5) which comprises of a dash line box around the taskbar button (126 – figure 19) to indicate which window display is currently being displayed on the screen at that instant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Chor's system to include an indicator to specify to the user which window is currently being displayed on the screen at that instant, as taught by Oran, for providing the user the ease of instantly knowing which window is currently displayed on the screen.

5. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chor in view of Ludolph (6,239,798).

As for claim 6, Chor fails to specifically disclose an internet capability wherein when a window display is closed by the user, the information data relating to that window is deleted from the information display.

In an analogous art, Ludolph discloses a computer receiver wherein when a window display is closed by the user, the information data relating to that window is deleted from the information display (630 and 640 – figure 6, col. 2, lines 1-12, col. 3, lines 42-53). This provides an expedient means to the user to exit an application and to inform the user that an application/window has been truly closed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Chor's system to include deleting data from an information display when a window is closed by the user, as taught by Oran, for the advantage of informing the user that a program is closed.

As for claim 17, Chor fails to specifically disclose a broadcast data receiver wherein when a window display is closed by the user, the information data is removed from the memory and hence the information display.

In an analogous art, Ludolph discloses a computer receiver wherein when a window display is closed by the user, the information data relating to that window is deleted from the information display (630 and 640 – figure 6, col. 2, lines 1-12, col. 3,


lines 42-53) and every workspace in which it existed (col. 3, lines 42 53). The feature of having the information data deleted from every workspace in which it existed, removes the information data from memory. This provides an expedient means to the user to exit an application and simultaneously erase the information data from memory to inform the user that an application/window has been truly closed and to provide the user the ease of not having to manually delete the data oneself.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Chor's system to include deleting data from an information display and memory when a window is closed by the user, as taught by Ludolph, for the advantage of informing the user that a program has been closed and to provide the advantage of not having to delete the data manually.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7292.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER